

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,701	02/03/2006	Xiaobao Chen	DYC-00700	3794	
28960 HAVERSTOC	7590 07/28/2010 K & OWENS LLP	EXAMINER			
162 N WOLFI	E ROAD	LEE, JAE YOUNG			
SUNNYVALI	E, CA 94086		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2466	2466	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/28/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/567,701	CHEN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAE Y. LEE	2466		

	JAE Y. LEE	2466					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: The period for reply expires	eplies: (1) an amendment, affid al (with appeal fee) in complian FR 1.114. The reply must be file date of the final rejection.	avit, or other evidence, v ce with 37 CFR 41.31; or ed within one of the follow	which places the r (3) a Request wing time				
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the ma b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN 1	ling date of the final rejection	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of valued **37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amou hortened statutory period for reply o	nt of the fee. The appropri- riginally set in the final Office	ate extension fee the action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the properties of the properties. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	to avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 3. \infty The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) \infty raise new issues that would require further co (b) \infty They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (d) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) \infty They are not deemed to place the application in the transfer the application in the transfer the trans	sideration and/or search (see N	OTE below);					
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ejected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).							
 Sor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		will be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under ap and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fail See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
/Daniel J. Ryman/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2466	/Jae Y Lee/ Examiner, Art Unit 24	66					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims 1 and 30 are amended in order to encompass structure, e.g., detector and recovery element for corresponding functions. However, it is not clear whether 112, 6th paragraph is invoked for each structure including detector and recovery element.

Assuming that 112, 6th paragraph is invoked for the structure, the applicant needs to prove that there is specific structure or algorithm corresponding to the function in the specification. Otherwise, it is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 2rd paragraph because there is no disclosure or insufficient disclosure of the structure of specific algorithm (or steps) for performing the function recited in a claim limitation invoking 35 U.S.C. 112, 6th paragraph.

Assuming that 112, 6" paragraph is not invoked for the structure, the claims may not be enabled to the full scope of the claim because the terms "detector" and "recovery element" cover all possible structures for performing the given functions, whereas applicant has only enabled those known to applicant.